



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This case overrules an earlier case. *Flaucher v. Camden*, 56 N. J. L. 244. Further, it disapproves of the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U. S. 425. For a discussion of the principles involved, see 21 HARV. L. REV. 153; 20 *ibid.* 580.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE — SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW — LIABILITY OF LABOR UNIONS. — The plaintiffs ran a non-union factory. The defendants, members of the Union Hatters of America and the American Federation of Labor, in an attempt to force the plaintiff to employ only union men, boycotted his goods and destroyed his business, which was largely interstate. *Held*, that the defendants' acts constitute a combination in restraint of interstate trade, made illegal by the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, and that the plaintiff, by § 7 of the Act, can recover threefold damages for the injury to his business. *Loewe v. Lawlor*, 208 U. S. 274.

By the better opinion boycotts are actionable at common law. See 20 HARV. L. REV. 429, 450. The present case is noteworthy in deciding for the first time that the person injured by a boycott which is in restraint of interstate commerce has the added remedy of a recovery of threefold damages. The court has already decided that a conspiracy in trade to refuse to sell to a retailer unless he conforms with certain restrictions is an illegal restraint under the Act. *Montague & Co. v. Loury*, 193 U. S. 38. The present decision merely applies the same principles to labor combinations. It therefore introduces no new principles, and the court could consistently have reached no other result without exempting labor unions from the law. And a combination of consumers to interfere with the interstate trade of any producer would likewise seem illegal, regardless of the motive. As the decision allows recovery against the individual members of the union, it seems to show the attitude of the court upon the question of the responsibility of individual members of a labor union for damages caused by strikes and other labor troubles.

RESTRICTIVE AGREEMENTS AS TO USE OF PROPERTY — COVENANT AGAINST EXERCISING TRADE — COVENANT TAKEN FOR PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING MONOPOLY. — The owner of a large tract of land on which a town was situated divided it into lots and conveyed them to different purchasers by deeds containing covenants by the vendees not to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors. His main purpose was to protect his own saloon from competitors. *Held*, that the covenants are void as creating a monopoly. *Burdell v. Grandi*, 92 Pac. 1022 (Cal.).

It is well settled that a covenant not to carry on a certain business on the land sold is enforceable. *McMahon v. Williams*, 79 Ala. 288. But where it is part of a general scheme to create a monopoly, a distinct question of public policy is presented. The older view was that an owner of land had an absolute right to dispose of it in any way. *Holmes v. Martin*, 10 Ga. 503; *Morris v. Tuscaloosa Mfg. Co.*, 83 Ala. 565. The modern rule is that he must not exercise his right so as to injure the public, and that if restrictive covenants create a monopoly they are void. *Chippewa Lumber Co. v. Tremper*, 75 Mich. 36. The result of enforcing the covenants in the present case would be to confine the whole town's source of supply of liquor to one man. In the case of most commodities the restriction should not be enforced. But it seems better public policy to restrict the sale of liquor than to encourage its use, and as the question is one of public policy only, the monopoly might well be allowed. See *Watrous v. Allen*, 57 Mich. 362.

TAXATION — PARTICULAR FORMS OF TAXATION — TIME OF ACCRUAL OF RIGHT OF STATE TO INHERITANCE TAX. — A resident of Massachusetts died intestate leaving personal property in both Massachusetts and New York to be distributed to a brother and certain nephews and nieces. Under a New York statute the shares of the nephews and nieces were subject to an inheritance tax, while the brother's share was exempt. To avoid the tax on the non-exempt shares the administrator elected to apply the New York assets to the payment of the brother's distributive share. *Held*, that he is liable for the tax, since the